

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 119

March 29, 1995, 4:36 p.m.
Page S-4788 Temp. Record

DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS/Savings for Deficit Reduction

SUBJECT: Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Byrd amendment No. 423 to the Hatfield substitute amendment No. 420.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 99-0

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$5.360 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, and will rescind \$17.188 billion for various Departments and agencies.

The Hatfield substitute amendment would strike the provisions of H.R. 1158 and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 617, as reported, which would provide \$6.700 billion in disaster assistance (the amount requested by the President), would rescind \$13.286 billion for various Departments and agencies, and would provide for expedited salvage timber sales on Federal lands for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

The Byrd amendment to the Hatfield substitute amendment would provide that any savings from this Act would be used to reduce the deficit. Specifically, it would require the lowering of the budget authority and outlay discretionary spending caps of the Budget Act for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 by the amount of any savings resulting from this Act, and would provide that reductions in outlays and in the discretionary spending limits would not be used to offset all or part of an increase in direct spending or a decrease in receipts.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Byrd amendment is straightforward. It would prevent using the savings from this Act for anything other than deficit reduction. If Senator Byrd had not offered it, Senator Domenici would have offered his amendment which would have had exactly the same effect. In other words, this amendment has very strong bipartisan support. Senators are determined to lower the deficit, and they intend to use the savings from this bill for that purpose. Some Senators also oppose any tax cuts, and intend their vote on the Byrd

(See other side)

YEAS (99)				NAYS (0)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (54 or 100%)		Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka	Inouye				Dorgan- ^{2AY}
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Baucus	Johnston				
Bennett	Jeffords	Biden	Kennedy				
Bond	Kassebaum	Bingaman	Kerrey				
Brown	Kempthorne	Boxer	Kerry				
Burns	Kyl	Bradley	Kohl				
Campbell	Lott	Breaux	Lautenberg				
Chafee	Lugar	Bryan	Leahy				
Coats	Mack	Bumpers	Levin				
Cochran	McCain	Byrd	Lieberman				
Cohen	McConnell	Conrad	Mikulski				
Coverdell	Murkowski	Daschle	Moseley-Braun				
Craig	Nickles	Dodd	Moynihan				
D'Amato	Packwood	Exon	Murray				
DeWine	Pressler	Feingold	Nunn				
Dole	Roth	Feinstein	Pell				
Domenici	Santorum	Ford	Pryor				
Faircloth	Shelby	Glenn	Reid				
Frist	Simpson	Graham	Robb				
Gorton	Smith	Harkin	Rockefeller				
Gramm	Snowe	Heflin	Sarbanes				
Grams	Specter	Hollings	Simon				
Grassley	Stevens		Wellstone				
Gregg	Thomas						
Hatch	Thompson						
Hatfield	Thurmond						
Helms	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

amendment to serve notice of this opposition to the House (the House is reportedly considering waiving the budget rules so it can use discretionary program savings to pay for tax cuts). These Senators' opposition to tax cuts is heightened by their belief that the tax cuts being considered by the House will favor the wealthy, and that the spending cuts under consideration will hurt the poor. Other Senators totally disagree with this class-warfare mentality, but agree that the savings in this Act should be used for deficit reduction. Many of these Senators believe that the tax burden on Americans is excessive and should be reduced, and that the preferred means of paying for those tax cuts is with entitlement cuts. The one view that most Senators share in common, though, is that the savings from this Act should be used to reduce the deficit. Therefore, this amendment should carry overwhelmingly.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.